

Saturday, September 3, 8 to 9 a. m.—Toland Hall, University Hospital. Lecture to fourth-year class.
9:30 to 10:30 a. m.—Toland Hall, University Hospital. Joint amphitheater clinics, departments of medicine and pediatrics. Subject: Diabetes mellitus.

Wednesday, September 7, 12 noon to 1 p. m.—San Francisco Hospital. Lecture to third-year class.

Wednesday September 14, 11 a. m. to 12 noon—Cole Hall Medical Building. Clinico-pathological conference.

Friday, September 16, 9 to 10:30 a. m.—Toland Hall, University Hospital. General pediatrics rounds.

8:15 p. m.—Toland Hall, University Hospital. Pediatric staff meeting.

Saturday, September 17, 8 to 9 a. m.—Toland Hall, University Hospital. Lecture to fourth-year class.

Tuesday, September 20, 8 to 9 a. m.—Cole Hall, Medical School Building. Lecture to second-year class.

Wednesday, September 21, 11 a. m. to 12 noon—Cole Hall, Medical School Building. Clinico-pathological conference.

Friday, September 23, 9 to 10:30 a. m.—Toland Hall, University Hospital. General pediatric rounds.

Saturday, September 24, 8 to 9 a. m.—Toland Hall, University Hospital. Lecture to fourth-year class.

CORRESPONDENCE

Subject of Following Letter: Impostor Solicitors for American Medical Association Publications.

Richmond, Calif., July 9, 1932.

To the Editor:—Two months ago a shabby-looking gentleman calling himself Mr. Mansfield, solicited orders for American Medical Association publications from various members of the profession and chiropractors in our city. This man has since been exposed as an impostor although he presented credentials from the American Medical Association, which are fictitious.

Another slicker who also victimized some of us, purported to be representing the Hoover Company of New York and solicited orders for physicians' frocks and gowns. In each instance, of course, the money obtained from the gullible customer was pocketed by the gentleman in question.

I believe that a warning to the profession would be helpful. Mr. Mansfield apparently came from the southern part of the state, and seemed to make his headquarters in San Francisco. Thank you for your coöperation.

Yours very truly,

(Signed) L. H. FRASER.

AMERICAN MEDICAL ASSOCIATION

Chicago, July 5, 1932.

Dear Doctor Pope:—When we received your wire regarding a Mr. Simpkinson who was taking subscriptions for *The Journal of the American Medical Association* at a reduced rate, we took the matter up with the National Publishers' Association. They advise they have no record of a Protective Circulation Company and that Carlton Simpkinson was recently connected with the International Sales Company. This company discharged him a few months ago due to irregular subscription methods. The complaints they received were from persons in Illinois and Iowa.

No doubt you will hear from the National Publishers' Association in regard to the complaints that you may have received about Simpkinson.

About a year ago a Mr. H. Mansfield applied to us for a position as solicitor and after we had investigated his ability and integrity we gave him permission to solicit orders for our publications. At that time he was located in St. Louis.

In the early part of December he was requested to do no more soliciting for us. Now, several California

physicians have complained that he called on them in April and May and collected amounts due for subscriptions to our publications. He neither sent us the money nor reported the transactions. Of course, this would only be natural on his part because we have asked him to do no more work for us. The fact of the matter is, however, that he has become an impostor.

We would be very thankful if you would publish a notice in your journal to the effect that Mr. H. Mansfield is not authorized to solicit and collect for subscriptions to the American Medical Association's publications and that he is an impostor.

Yours very truly,

AMERICAN MEDICAL ASSOCIATION.

(Signed) A. W. Stack.

Subject of Following Letter: San Francisco Ordinance Regulating the Operation, Maintenance and Licensing of Clinics.

To the Editor:—For your information I am enclosing herewith copy of an ordinance regulating the operating, maintenance and licensing of clinics in this city.

Before presenting this to the Board of Supervisors this ordinance was discussed with the various interested groups, and the San Francisco County Medical Society rendered valuable aid in furthering its passage.

With kindest personal regards, I am

Sincerely,

(Signed) J. C. GEIGER, M. D.,
Director.

Editor's Note.—The ordinance is printed in this number of California and Western Medicine, page 141.

CONCERNING ANTIVIVISECTION

The editorial department of this issue of CALIFORNIA AND WESTERN MEDICINE presents some comments on the protests of antivivisection proponents in San Francisco. (See page 124.)

Below are reprinted two articles which are pertinent thereto. The first is an editorial from the San Francisco *Chronicle* dealing with the situation above noted. The second is from the *British Medical Journal* of June 25, 1932, being a report of the Research Defense Society. The excerpts follow.

QUESTION IS ONE OF FACTS

Various well-meaning but misinformed persons have been trying to make trouble for City Health Officer Dr. J. C. Geiger by reason of a quite incidental recommendation that some of the dogs now uselessly asphyxiated in the pound might be usefully chloroformed in the university research laboratories. The cry is, of course, "cruelty."

This raises a question, not of argument, but of fact. If it were indeed a question of transferring these dogs from a merciful death in the pound to the tortures attributed to "vivisection," obviously no humane person, least of all Doctor Geiger, would propose any such atrocity. Or if there were any real question of the usefulness of scientific experimentation in research on animals, the Mayor and the Board of Supervisors would not be the most expert judges of that controversy.

The trouble is with the alleged facts. Either these tales of "vivisection cruelty" are unfounded, so far as the responsible research laboratories of our recognized institutions are concerned, or else all the men to whom we have entrusted the higher education of our youth are liars. They say, on their personal knowledge, that these things are not true. If they were thus lying to the people, they would not be fit to be trusted with the custody of our youth, to say nothing of the custody of condemned dogs in the pound. The argument thus proves too much. Similarly as to the usefulness of these experiments. There are indeed those who deny that animal experimentation has contributed anything to the welfare of man. But those who say this do not include one person who is now recognized officially as an authority on the subject. There is not one professor of biology, physiology, or pathology in any university in the world—not one—who questions the usefulness, and indeed the absolute necessity of these experiments. Either the scientific institutions of the world are unanimously mistaken, in all their appointments to these positions, or else the opponents, none of

whom is recognized by other scientists as a scientific authority, are in error.

With, therefore, the unanimous consensus of the informed on Doctor Geiger's side, there is no reason why the Mayor and Supervisors should be disturbed by objections from a small group of the uninformed.—*San Francisco Chronicle*, July 11, 1932.

RESEARCH DEFENSE SOCIETY

SIR ARTHUR KEITH ON THE CONFLICT BETWEEN SENTIMENT AND REASON

The annual meeting of the Research Defense Society was held at the London School of Tropical Medicine on June 15, and was made the occasion of the delivery of the Stephen Paget Memorial Lecture by Sir Arthur Keith.

Lord Lamington, who presided, referred in terms of deep regret to the death of Lord Knutsford, the chairman of the society, and reminded the gathering of the great work he had done on behalf of the hospitals and of all who suffered. He announced that the Hon. Sir Arthur Stanley had consented to serve as chairman in Lord Knutsford's stead. No man was better known, especially for his activities on behalf of the British Red Cross Society, and his acceptance of the post was in itself a testimony to the work being done by the Research Defense Society. He pointed out that the society was engaged in defense of discoveries which would result, not only in the prevention or mitigation of human pain, but of animal pain also, and the true criterion to apply in connection with that terrible word "vivisection" was whether or not the activities engaged in brutalized the nature.

Sir Arthur Keith began his lecture with a reminder that in other fields of scientific research—in physics, chemistry, geology, and botany—experimental work was not impeded by considerations of sentiment. The conflict between sentiment and reason was felt acutely by medical students when they had to spend sessions in the postmortem room: some were indeed so upset by the experience and the dread of such intimate contact with the dead that they forsook the study of medicine for something less harrowing. The judge on the bench had in a measure to divest himself of his natural instincts if he was to administer the law to the criminal; while the crowd, bemoaning the end which awaited the man in the condemned cell, forgot the justice due to the woman whom the criminal had widowed and the children he had made fatherless. Among teachers, again, there was a growing feeling that the physical punishment of scholars was an unjustifiable form of cruelty. In fact, sentiment asserted itself more and more as a ruling force. The repugnance to eugenic measures of surgery sprang from sentiment rather than from reason, and the domination of sentiment was seen in a growing degree among highly civilized peoples. But if sentiment was completely to subjugate reason the ultimate result for civilization would be disaster and not progress. Man's powers of sympathy, primarily intended for the succor of his fellows, had been extended in recent times beyond the confines of the family or the tribe to include all animals which entered into friendly relations with him. Four thousand years ago, when failure to hunt involved starvation, the animals pursued had a sporting chance of escape, but under present conditions the animal grazing within enclosures had no chance of avoiding slaughter when time was ripe. In some of the civilizations of the East sentimentalism had been enthroned to such an extent that animal life in every form was accounted sacred, and the more vermin a devotee harbored between his garments and his skin the greater was his merit. To place animal life on an equality with human life meant that the proper religion was Buddhism. It was better honestly to recognize the conditions of existence, and that there was no alternative to living on the products of life.

If to nature was ascribed the endowment of man with the god-like qualities of mercy and sympathy, to what source was the vice of cruelty to be traced? Civilized man could certainly be cruel. By his spoken and written words he could outdo the worst wounds caused by the poisoned darts of savages. The power of being cruel might be latent or suppressed, but it was never missing from the gamut of human nature. What purpose could cruelty have served in the survival of the people? In the creation of man it could be assumed that nature had done nothing in vain. In the late war frightfulness was deliberately practiced to terrorize the opposing people. Cruelty had been given to man for the same reason as the sting to the wasp and the thorn to the rose bush—for protection and to make his enemies fear. Everyone wished to see thoughtless cruelty eliminated, none more so than the members of the Research Defense Society; but there seemed to exist beings in human shape who caused cruelty for the sake of the pleasure they experienced by it.

Sir Arthur Keith went on to say that it had been his privilege to know many of those who had advanced the resources of medicine by operations on anesthetized animals, and all had been tender-hearted men, who were convinced that by a present sacrifice of animal life they would make the world better for both man and beast. To watch a surgeon operating would convince anyone that if the patient had been his own child he could not have been more tender and careful. Yet he had heard such men branded as malefactors and criminals. Of all forms of cruelty there were none more diabolical than those which depended upon a wilful misinterpretation of

motive. If there was need for a society to save animals from unnecessary suffering, there was also need for an organization to save scientific men from the cruelty of misrepresentation and injustice. If reason were the sole arbiter in deciding whether or not vivisection was justifiable the public jury of England would long ago have returned a verdict in favor of that society; and if reason could convince its opponents, backed by masses of evidence, they would long ago have been reduced to silence. But reason did not hold the scepter of public opinion, and it was necessary to continue to produce evidence and so enlighten the public. The Research Defense Society also had to do more than defend those who sought to relieve suffering by research, but on occasion it had to take the offensive when it saw the charitable heart of the public being misdirected. In conclusion, he made an allusion to Stephen Paget, the founder of the society, who in his "Confesso Medici" revealed some of the mental conflicts he had endured before he found his real mission in life in the defense of research as the true handmaid of medical progress. In the pursuit of the society's aims no labor was too arduous for Paget, for the great cause of the relief of suffering through research carried him triumphantly onward. Sir Arthur also paid a generous tribute to the late Lord Knutsford.

Sir Arthur Stanley, in proposing a vote of thanks to Sir Arthur Keith, said that he felt more than ever sure, after Sir Arthur's eloquent words, that the society was right in its aims.

Lord Moynihan, in seconding, said that Sir Arthur concealed under a very distinguished Scottish name and the remnants of a Scottish accent both a Hibernian mind and a Hibernian personality. He traced the steps in their lecturer's career from the time he was anatomist at the London Hospital to his present position, remarking that he had created the Department of Anthropology in the Royal College of Surgeons, and had made it one of the College's greatest achievements.—*British Medical Journal*.

CLINIC ORDINANCE OF SAN FRANCISCO*

Defining Clinics and Dispensaries and Providing for the Operation, Maintenance, and Licensing Thereof

(Code No. 17.10)

Bill No. 123, Ordinance No. 17.101, as follows:

Be it ordained by the People of the City and County of San Francisco as follows:

Section 1. For the purpose of this ordinance a dispensary or clinic or other designation of like interpretation is declared to be a person, place, establishment, corporation, institution, association or agent whose purpose it is, either independently or in connection with any other purpose, to furnish at any place or places, either without charge or for part pay or full pay, medical and/or surgical or dental treatment or advice, or medicine or apparatus, or drugless healing or manipulation, or mental and habit advice and treatment which will include psychiatric and neurological advice, mental healing and faith cures of all types, to any person or persons nonresident, or ambulatory therein, who are suffering from or afflicted with bodily and/or mental infirmities or ailments of any kind whatsoever.

None of the provisions of this ordinance shall apply to what is known as the private practice of medicine or any other curative or remedial system.

Section 2. It shall be unlawful for any person, place, establishment, corporation, institution, association or agent to open, conduct, manage or maintain any dispensary or clinic as above defined within the incorporated limits of the City and County of San Francisco without first obtaining a permit and license therefor as herein-after provided, and said license shall not be granted without a permit first being had and obtained.

Every person, firm or corporation conducting a clinic or dispensary as herein defined shall pay a license fee of six (\$6) dollars per quarter.

Section 3. Any person, place, establishment, corporation, institution, association or agent desiring such license shall make written application therefor to the Director of Public Health, in conformation with the general provisions of this ordinance relating to applications for licenses, and shall truly state in said application the location or proposed location of such dispensary, the purpose for which it is or is to be opened, conducted and maintained, the accommodations or proposed accommodations for patients which it shall contain, the nature and kind of treatment given or proposed to be given therein, and the name and addresses of the person or persons making the application and the names of the person or persons who are conducting or will conduct said dispensary or clinic, stating their training and qualifications for conducting such dispensary or clinic.

*For editorial comments, see page 123.